

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 and 33-61 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 19, 33 and 51 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 19, 33, 35, 36 and 51 have been amended. Claims 4, 35 and 36 have been amended to address matters of form. Support for amendments to claims 1, 19, 33 and 51 can be found specifically at Figure 2 and page 7, lines 4-19 of the present application. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the remarks included herein.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-29 and 33-61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0260700 by Wang et al. (hereafter “Wang”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,522,073 to Courant et al. (hereafter “Courant”) in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055666 by Kornerup et al. (hereafter “Kornerup”) (Office Action, page 2).

1. Claims 1-18 and 33-50

Claim 1 recites:

“A method for controlling model execution in a graphical modeling environment, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a graphical model with a plurality of executable time-based components, said graphical model including at least one user-configurable graphical post component representing an event, **said graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal;**

identifying when said condition is satisfied during execution of said graphical model;

posting said notice of an occurrence of said event in said graphical modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of said occurrence of said event; and

executing at least one component from said plurality of components in response to said notifying.”

Wang, Courant, and Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. For example, Wang, Courant, and Kornerup do not disclose or suggest **a graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as recited in amended claim 1.

As correctly stated by the Examiner, Wang does not teach a graphical post component, as recited in claim 1 (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner cites to Courant for the teaching of a graphical post component. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Courant fails at curing the shortcomings of Wang with respect to **a graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as recited in amended claim 1. Nowhere does Courant disclose or suggest **a graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as present in Applicants' claim 1.

Courant discusses a user selecting a "when" event and selecting one or more "then" events (Col. 2, lines 34-48). The user creates a routine that he can save, enable or disable (Col. 2, lines 49-52). When different routines are enabled, a message connector registers the different "when" events for each routine and then waits for any of the messages to be heard. When the message connector hears the message for a "when" event, the message connector sends out all of the "then" operation messages associated with the detected "when" event message (Col. 2, lines 58-64). The message connector of Courant is not equivalent to the graphical post component recited in claim 1. Specifically, the message connector of Courant does not have **at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal**, as recited in amended claim 1. Hence the message connector of Courant cannot **specify a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as further recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, the combination of Wang and Courant fails to disclose or suggest **a graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as recited in claim 1.

It is not clear from the Office Action how the Examiner is applying Kornerup to Wang and Courant to render the features of claim 1 obvious. Kornerup discusses execution of a timed loop based on the occurrence of an associated event (see paragraph 0135 discussing Figure 5). However, there is absolutely no disclosure in Kornerup that a user-configurable graphical post component is provided in a graphical model in the Kornerup system as a means for controlling the timed loop's execution. Therefore a combination of Wang, Courant and Kornerup fails to disclose or suggest **a graphical post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, said graphical post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Wang, Courant and Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. Applicants respectfully requests allowance of claim 1. Furthermore, since claims 2-18 are dependent upon claim 1, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 2-18. Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claims 2-18.

Claim 33 is a medium claim corresponding to claim 1 and Applicants submit that claim 33 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed for claim 1. Claims 34-50 are dependent upon claim 33, and Applicants therefore submit that the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 34-50. Applicants request the allowance of claims 34-50.

2. Claims 19-30 and 51-61

Claim 19 recites:

“A method for controlling model execution in a modeling environment, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a model with a plurality of executable components, the model including at least one user-configurable post component representing an event, **the post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, the post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal**;

identifying when said condition is satisfied during the execution of said model;

posting said notice of an occurrence of said event in said modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of said occurrence of said event;

interrupting execution of an executing event in response to the determination of the occurrence of said specified event; and performing an operation in said model in response to the determination of the occurrence of the specified event.”

The combination of Wang in view of Courant in further view of Kornerup fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 19. More specifically, the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest **a post component having at least one input port for receiving at least one input signal, the post component specifying a condition associated with the at least one input signal.** Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion regarding claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 19.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, since Wang, Courant and Kornerup, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 19, Applicants request the allowance of claim 19. Furthermore, since claims 20-29 are dependent upon claim 19, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 20-29 and Applicants request the allowance of claims 20-29.

Claim 51 is a medium claim corresponding to claim 19 and Applicants submit that claim 51 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed for claim 19. Claims 52-61 are dependent upon claim 51, and Applicants therefore submit that the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the elements of dependent claims 52-61. Applicants request the allowance of claims 52-61.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-056RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: June 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicants